16   Udāna Sutta

The Discourse on the Inspired Utterance | **S 22.55**
Theme: Consciousness works with the aggregates
Translated by Piya Tan ©2006

1 Introduction

1.1 According to the Sutta commentary, the Buddha's inspired utterance (*udāna*)—"'It might not be, it might not be for me; and it will not be, it will not be for me,'[1] resolving thus, that a monk would cut off the lower fetters"[2] [2]. The first 5 lower fetters (*oram,bhāgiya*) of the 10 fetters[3] are so called because they bind us to the lower realms, that is, the sense-world. The remaining 5 are the higher fetters (*uddham,-bhāgiya*): they bind one to the higher realms, that is, the form world and the formless world. Either way we are thus fettered to samsara.

1.2 An ***udāna*** is an inspired utterance moved by powerful joy from reflecting on the liberating quality (*niyyānika,bhāva*) of the teaching (SA 2:273). Usually, it is a jubilant, that is, a positive and uplifting, statement (such as those recorded in the Udāna, one of the books of the Khuddaka Nikāya). Broadly, the term includes "lion-roar" (*sīha,nāda*) (a public witnessing of faith in the Buddha and his teaching)[4] and statements of spiritual urgency (*saṁvega*).[5]

1.3 The Commentary speaks of three supports by way of necessary condition (*upanissaya*) for spiritual progress, that is,

the support of charity,	*dānûpanissaya*
the support of moral virtue, and	*sīlûpanissaya*
the support of mental cultivation.	*bhāvanûpanissaya*

Of these, says Buddhaghosa, the support of charity is weak (*dubbala*), but the support of mental cultivation is strong (*balava*). Supported by charity and by moral virtue, we attain the paths and the fruits, but only the support of mental cultivation can bring us arhathood. (SA 2:273)

2 *No c'assa no ca me siyā, na bhavissati na me bhavissatîti* [§2]

2.0 The most difficult sentence in the Sutta clearly is this: ***No c'assa no ca me siyā, na bhavissati na me bhavissatî ti*** [§2], an important statement found in a number of other suttas (see below). This statement is found in the suttas in two forms: (1) the annihilationist [2.1] and the Buddha's usage [2.2].[6]

2.1 ANNIHILATIONISM

2.1.1 The annihilationist (*uccheda,diṭṭhi*) version—***no c'assaṁ no ca me siyā, na bhavissāmi na me bhavissatî ti,***[7] "If it were not, then there might be not for me, too; neither will it be for me nor will there be for me" (called "the *no c'assaṁ* passage")—is found in **the Kosala Sutta 1** (A 10.29), the Buddha de-

---

[1] PTS: *no c'assa no ca me siyā, na bhavissati na me bhavissatî ti.* Be: *no c'assaṁ no ca me siyā, na bhavissa na me bhavissatî ti.* Ce Se: *no c'assaṁ no ca me siyā, na bhavissati na me bhavissatî ti.* Nālandā ed: *no c'assaṁ no ca me siyā, nābhavissaṁ na me bhavissatî ti.*

[2] See Bodhi's useful long n, much of which is summarized or quoted here (S:B 1060 n65).

[3] **The 10 fetters** (*saṁyojana*) are: (1) self-identity view (*sakkāya,diṭṭhi*), (2) spiritual doubt (*vicikicchā*), (3) attachment to rules and rites (*sīla-b,bata,parāmāsa*), (4) sensual lust (*kāma,rāga*), (5) repulsion (*paṭigha*), (6) greed for form existence (*rūpa,rāga*), (7) greed for formless existence (*arūpa,rāga*), (8) conceit (*māna*), (9) restlessness (*uddhacca*), (10) ignorance (*avijjā*) (S 5:61, A 5:13, Vbh 377). In some places, no. 5 (*paṭigha*) is replaced by ill will (*vyāpāda*).

[4] See SD 36.10 (3).

[5] See SD 9 (7f).

[6] For a fuller discussion, see S:B 1060 n75.

[7] Choong identifies this sentence with this Chinese reading at SĀ 64: 法無有吾我，亦復無我所，我既非當有，我所何由生？(2000:57): see below 2(2) for tr. He thinks, "It is possible that the earlier unsanskritised form, with 8 syllables per line, was: *no c'assaṁ no ca me siyā, nāhessaṁ na me hessati.*" (2000:57 n94). This Chinese reading, however, fits *no c'assa no ca me siyā, na bhavissati na me bhavissati* better: see (2) here.

clares it to be "the foremost of outside speculative views" (*etad-aggaṁ bāhirakānaṁ diṭṭhi,gatānaṁ*), the reason being that one who accepts such a view would neither be attracted to existence nor be averse to the ending of cessation.[8]

2.1.2 In this connection, **Bodhi** notes:

> It is problematic how the optative clause in the annihilationist version should be interpreted; per-haps it can be read as an assertion that personal existence, along with its experienced world, is utterly fortuitous ("I might not have been and it might not have been mine"). The clause in the future clearly asserts that personal existence and its world will terminate at death. (S:B 1061 n75)

2.1.3 The "*no c'assaṁ* passage" is also found in **the Pārileyya Sutta** (S 22.81), where it is explicitly identified as an annihilationist view,[9] and where Bodhi follows the Sinhalese and PTS readings[10] (the Burmese MS reads the 3rd negated verb as *nâbhavissaṁ*). The Burmese reading goes *no c'assaṁ no ca me siyā, nâbhavissāmi na me bhavissati*.

The Saṁyutta Commentary—reading *c'* as *ce*—explains it as: "If I were not to be, neither would there be my belongings; if I will not be in the future, neither will there be my belongings" (*sace ahaṁ na bhaveyyaṁ mama parikkhāro pi na bhaveyya...sace pana āyatim pi ahaṁ na bhavissāmi evam mama parikkhāro pi na bhavissati*).[11]

2.1.4 The Saṁyutta Commentary here takes *c'* as *ce,* that is, *sace* ("if")*,* and its Porāṇa Ṭīkā, too, glosses it as *yadi*. However, parallel passages in the Sanskrit have **ca** ("and")[12] If we take *c'* as *ce,* then this alternate translation is possible: "**If I were not to be, neither *it* would there be for me; if I will not be in the future, neither will *it* be for me**."

This is however reflective more of an idealist viewpoint, when the proponent's view is that when he ceases to exists, all things would not exist, too. Of course a materialist could also hold such an view, that is, this is his only life, without any hereafter, and when he dies, the whole world cease for him, at least.

2.1.5 As such, a better translation here would be "I will not be, *and* it will not be for me." Here, the first "it" can be taken to refer to the personal five aggregates, and the second to the world as perceived through the aggregates. Alternately, the first "it" might be taken to refer to craving, and the second to the five aggregates. In this connection, see also **the Eso Attā Sutta** (S 22.152)[13] and **the So Attā Sutta** (S 24.4),[14] where the statement is regarded as a wrong view.

2.2 THE BUDDHA'S USAGE

2.2.1 By replacing the 1st person verbs with their 3rd person counterparts, the Buddha changed this formula into a Dharma-based "*no c'assa*" statement**:** *no c'assa no ca me siyā, na bhavissati na me bhavissati.* Bodhi notes, "The change of person shifts the stress from the view of self implicit in the annihila-tionist version ('I will be annihilated') to an impersonal perspective that harmonizes with the *anattā* doc-trine."[15] This usage is found in **the Udāna Sutta** (S 22.55).[16]

2.2.2 Apparently, the "*no c'assa* passage" has a Saṁyukta Āgama counterpart (the only one, accord-ing to CHOONG Mun Keat, who identified it)[17] in this Chinese translation:

法無有吾我，亦復無我所，我既非當有，我所何由生？

---

[8] A 10.29,12/5:63,29 = SD 16.15.

[9] S 22.81,26/3:99 = SD 6.1.

[10] For some unstated reason, Bodhi, as a rule, does not mention the Siamese Tipiṭaka (Se), throughout his translat-ed works.

[11] SA 2:275 = 306.

[12] Eg U 78 || Uv 15.4.

[13] S 22.152/3:182 f.

[14] S 24.4/3:205 f.

[15] S:B 1061 = n75.

[16] S 22.55/3:55.

[17] CHOONG Mun Keat 2000:57.

Dharmas (phenomena) are not-self, and not belonging to self. Since self will not be, whence will there be belonging to self?   (T2.16c)[18]

In short, the Chinese translation takes it as "neither self nor belonging to self" (Choong 2000:57). For our discussion thus far, it is evident that the Chinese passage is actually the counterpart of the "*no c'assa* passage" (of the Buddha's usage) rather than the "*no c'assaṁ* passage" (of the annihilationists).

2.2.3 In **the Āneñja,sappāya Sutta** (M 106), we find this formula with a rider, *yad atthi yaṁ bhū-taṁ, taṁ pajahāmi,* "I abandon that which is, that which has come to be."[19] This contemplation leads to equanimity. If one practises (based on the full formula and the rider) but clings to equanimity, one gains rebirth in the base of neither-perception-nor-non-perception, or, if there is no clinging to equanimity, on attains nirvana.[20]

2.2.4 The Sutta commentary explains the passage in terms of the annihilationist view as follows:

> If the fivefold[21] round of karma had not been accumulated by me, now there would not be for me the round of results: if the fivefold round of karma is not accumulated by me now, in the future there will not be the rounds of results.   (MA 4:65 f)

2.2.5 In **the Purisa,gati Sutta** (A 7.52), a resolution, guided by the formula and the rider, brings one to one of the five levels of non-returning or to arhathood itself.[22]

2.2.6 A shorter formula is applied in **the Kaccāna Sutta** (U 7.8) to the mindfulness of the body, and one who dwells thus gradually goes beyond attachment, that is, gains arhathood.[23]

2.3 BODHI'S INTERPRETATIONS. Regarding these usages, **Bodhi** (in *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha*, 2000) makes the following important and instructive note:[24]

> It may be significant that in the Nikāyas the precise meaning of the formula is never replicat-ed, which suggest it may have functioned as an open-ended guide to reflection to be filled in by the meditator through personal intuition. As to the actual word meaning, the commentaries take the opening particle *c'* to represent *ce,* "if," glosses *sace* by [SA] and *yadi* by [SAṬ]. On this basis they interpret each part of the formula as a conditional.
>
> [SA] explains the formula in [**the Udāna Sutta**, S 22.55] on the basis of the questionable reading *c' assaṁ,* though its second alternative conforms to the superior reading *c'assa.* I trans-late here from [SA] very literally, rendering the lemma in the way favoured by the explanation: "*If I were not, it would not be for me:* If I were not (*sace ahaṁ na bhaveyyaṁ*), neither would there be my belongings (*mama parikkhāro*). Or else: If in my past there had not been kammic formation [*kammābhisaṅkhāro*],[25] now there would not be for me these five aggregates. *I will not be, (and) it will not be for me:* I will now so strive that there will not be any kammic formation of mine producing the aggregates in the future; when that is absent, there will be for me no future rebirth."
>
> I part with the commentaries on the meaning of *c',* which I take to represent *ca*; the syntax of the phrase as a whole clearly requires this. The [Sanskrit] parallels actually contain *ca* (eg at Uv 15.4, parallel to U 78). If we accept this reading, then [in the Udāna Sutta] the first "it" can be taken to refer to the personal aggregates, the second to the world apprehended through the aggre-

---

[18] Choong qu from 雜阿含經論會編 *Combined Edition of Sūtra and Śāstra of the Saṁyuktāgama* 1983 1:102. Choong orig identifies this passage with the one in **Udāna S** (S 22.55/3:55), SD 17.16.

[19] **Āneñja,sappāya S** (M 106.8/2:264); **Purisa,gati S** (A 7.52/4:70-74, passim).

[20] M 106.11-12/2:265.

[21] Here "fivefold" (*pañca,vidha*) refers to the 5 aggregates (MAṬ:Be 2:257).

[22] A 7.52/4:70-74.

[23] U 7.8/78,2-3.

[24] Bodhi's n runs about 2½ pages, and here only the latter half is quoted: for full n, see S:B 1060 n75.

[25] Bodhi's orig reading: *kammābhi-saṅkhāro.*

gates. For the worldling this dyad is misconstrued as the duality of self and world; for the noble disciple it is simply the duality of internal and external phenomena.

On this basis, I would interpret the formula thus: "The five aggregates can be terminated, and the world presented by them can be terminated. I will so strive that the five aggregates will be terminated, (and) so that the world presented by them will be terminated." Alternatively, the first "it" might be taken to refer to craving, and the second to the five aggregates arisen through craving. In the additional rider, "what exists, what has come to be" [*yad atthi yaṁ bhūtaṁ*] denotes the presently existent set of five aggregates, which are being abandoned through the abandonment of the cause for their continued re-manifestation, namely, craving or desire-and-lust [*chanda,-rāga*].   (S:B 1062 f = n75; refs normalized)

— — —

The Discourse on the Inspired Utterance
S 22.55

1   At Sāvatthī.

THE UNINSTRUCTED WORLDLING

2   At that time, the Blessed One uttered an inspired utterance:
"'**It might not be, it might not be for me; and it will not be, it will not be for me**,'[26] **[56]** resolving thus, that a monk would cut off the lower fetters."[27]

3   When was this said, a certain monk said to the Blessed One:
"But how, bhante, can a monk, resolving thus: 'It might not be, it might not be for me; and it will not be, it will not be for me,' cut off the lower fetters?"

4   "Here, bhikshu, one is an uninstructed worldling [ignorant ordinary] person, who has no regard for the noble ones and is unskilled and undisciplined in their Dharma,
who has no regard for the true individuals and is unskilled and undisciplined in their Dharma:[28]

he regards **form** as self,	or self as possessing form,
or form as in self,	or self as in form;
he regards **feeling** as self,	or self as possessing feeling,
or feeling as in self,	or self as in feeling;
he regards **perception** as self,	or self as possessing perception,
or perception as in self,	or self as in perception;
he regards **formations** as self,	or self as possessing formations,
or formations as in self,	or self as in formations;
he regards **consciousness** as self,	or self as possessing consciousness,
or consciousness as in self,	or self as in consciousness.

The aggregates are impermanent
5   `He does not understand that <u>form</u> is **impermanent**, as it really is: *form* is impermanent.[29]

---

[26] *No c'assa no ca me siyā, na bhavissati na me bhavissatî ti.* On problems regarding its reading, see Intro (2).

[27] Here the attainment of non-returning (*anāgāmitā*) is meant. On the lower fetters, see Intro (1).

[28] These are <u>the 4 basic modes of self-identity view</u>: for a full passage on how rejecting these 4 modes in terms of the aggregates leads to "immediate destruction of the x," see **Pārileyya S** (S 22.81.14-27/3:96-99), SD 6.1, **Paṭisambhidā,magga** explains the 4 modes in connection with form with the following analogies: <u>form as self</u> = a burning oil-lamp's flame and its flame are identical; <u>self as possessing form</u> = the shadow of a tree possesses; <u>form as in self</u> = the scent in the flower; <u>self as in form</u> = a jewel in a casket (Pm 2.50, 74, 77, 90 = 1:143-145).

He does not understand that <u>feeling</u> is *impermanent*, as it really is: *feeling* is impermanent.
He does not understand that <u>perception</u> is *impermanent*, as it really is: *perception* is impermanent.
He does not understand that <u>formations</u> are *impermanent*, as it really is: *formations* are impermanent.
He does not understand that <u>consciousness</u> is *impermanent*, as it really is: *consciousness* is impermanent.

The aggregates are unsatisfactory

6 He does not understand that <u>form</u> is **unsatisfactory**, as it really is: *form* is unsatisfactory.
He does not understand that <u>feeling</u> is *unsatisfactory*, as it really is: *feeling* is unsatisfactory.
He does not understand that <u>perception</u> is *unsatisfactory*, as it really is: *perception* is unsatisfactory.
He does not understand that <u>formations</u> are *unsatisfactory*, as it really is: *formations* are unsatisfactory.
He does not understand that <u>consciousness</u> is *unsatisfactory*, as it really is:*consciousness* is unsatisfactory.

The aggregates are not self

7 He does not understand that <u>form</u> is **not self**, as it really is: *form* is non-self.
He does not understand that <u>feeling</u> is *not self*, as it really is: *feeling* is non-self.
He does not understand that <u>perception</u> is *not self*, as it really is: *perception* is non-self.
He does not understand that <u>formations</u> are *not self*, as it really is: *formations* are non-self.
He does not understand that <u>consciousness</u> is *not self*, as it really is: *consciousness* is non-self.

The aggregates are conditioned

8 He does not understand that <u>form</u> is **conditioned**, as it really is: *form* is conditioned.
He does not understand that <u>feeling</u> is *conditioned*, as it really is: *feeling* is conditioned.
He does not understand that <u>perception</u> is *conditioned*, as it really is: *perception* is conditioned.
He does not understand that <u>formations</u> are *conditioned*, as it really is: *formations* are conditioned.
He does not understand that <u>consciousness</u> is *conditioned*, as it really is: *consciousness* is conditioned.

The aggregates will cease

9 He does not understand, as it really is, that <u>form</u> **will cease to be**.[30]
He does not understand, as it really is, that <u>feeling</u> *will cease to be*.
He does not understand, as it really is, that <u>perception</u> *will cease to be*.
He does not understand, as it really is, that <u>formations</u> *will cease to be*.
He does not understand, as it really is, that <u>consciousness</u> *will cease to be*. **[57]**

THE INSTRUCTED NOBLE DISCIPLE

10 Bhikshu, the instructed noble disciple, who has regard for the noble ones and is skilled and disciplined in their Dharma,
 who has regard for the true individuals and is skilled and disciplined in their Dharma:
  he does *not* regard **form** as <u>self</u>, nor self as possessing form,
   nor form as in self,   nor self as in form;
  he does *not* regard **feeling** as self, nor self as possessing feeling,
   nor feeling as in self,   nor self as in feeling;

---

[29] The whole sentence: *So aniccaṁ rūpam aniccaṁ rūpan'ti yathā,bhūtaṁ na pajānāti.*

[30] *Rūpaṁ vibhavissati,* which Comy glosses as *rūpaṁ bhijjissati,* "Form will break up" (SA 2:275), and Sub-comy uses *vinasissati,* "will perish" (SAṬ:Be 2:224). Apparently, these commentators regard *vibhavissati* her as the momentary cessation of the aggregates, but **Bodhi** comments, "I believe the verb refers to the final cessation of the aggregates with the attainment of the *anupādisesa,nibbāna,dhātu.* This meaning harmonizes better with the opening formula, and also seems supported by Tha 715cd: *saṅkhārā vibhavissant, tattha kā paridevanā,* "formations (only) will be exterminated, so what lamentation can there be over that." (S:B 1063 n76)

he does *not* regard **perception** as *self*,	nor self as possessing perception,
nor perception as in self,	nor self as in perception;
he does *not* regard **formations** as *self*,	nor self as possessing formations,
nor formations as in self,	nor self as in formations;
he does *not* regard **consciousness** as *self*,	nor self as possessing consciousness,
nor consciousness as in self,	nor self as in consciousness.

The aggregates are impermanent

11 He understands, as it really is, that <u>form</u> is **impermanent**:   '*Form* is impermanent.'
He understands, as it really is, that <u>feeling</u> is impermanent: '*Feeling* is impermanent.'
He understands, as it really is, that <u>perception</u> is impermanent: '*Perception* is impermanent.'
He understands, as it really is, that <u>formations</u> are impermanent: '*Formations* are impermanent.'
He understands, as it really is, that <u>consciousness</u> is impermanent: '*Consciousness* is impermanent.'

The aggregates are unsatisfactory

12 He understands, as it really is, that <u>form</u> is **unsatisfactory**:   '*Form* is unsatisfactory.'
He understands, as it really is, that <u>feeling</u> is unsatisfactory: '*Feeling* is unsatisfactory.'
He understands, as it really is, that <u>perception</u> is unsatisfactory: '*Perception* is unsatisfactory.'
He understands, as it really is, that <u>formations</u> are unsatisfactory: '*Formations* is unsatisfactory.'
He understands, as it really is, that <u>consciousness</u> is unsatisfactory: '*Consciousness* is unsatisfactory.'

The aggregates are not self

13 He understands, as it really is, that <u>form</u> is **not self**:   '*Form* is not self.'
He understands, as it really is, that <u>feeling</u> is not self: '*Feeling* is not self.'
He understands, as it really is, that <u>perception</u> is not self: '*Perception* is not self.'
He understands, as it really is, that <u>formations</u> are not self: '*Formations* are not self.'
He understands, as it really is, that <u>consciousness</u> is not self: '*Consciousness* is not self.'

The aggregates are conditioned

14 He understands, as it really is, that <u>form</u> is **conditioned**:   '*Form* is conditioned.'
He understands, as it really is, that <u>feeling</u> is conditioned: '*Feeling* is conditioned.'
He understands, as it really is, that <u>perception</u> is conditioned: '*Perception* is conditioned.'
He understands, as it really is, that <u>formations</u> are conditioned: '*Formations* are conditioned.'
He understands, as it really is, that <u>consciousness</u> is conditioned: '*Consciousness* is conditioned.'

The aggregates will cease to be

15 He understands, as it really is: '<u>Form</u>   will cease to be.'[31]
He understands, as it really is   '<u>Feeling</u>   will cease to be.'
He understands, as it really is: '<u>Perception</u>   will cease to be.'
He understands, as it really is: '<u>Formations</u>   will cease to be.'
He understands, as it really is: '<u>Consciousness</u>   will cease to be.'

When the aggregates have ceased

16 With the ceasing of   form,
with the ceasing of   feeling,
with the ceasing of   perception,
with the ceasing of   formations,
with the ceasing of   consciousness,

---

[31] *Rūpaṁ vibhavissati yathā,bhūtaṁ pajānāti:* see §9 n above.

that monk, resolving thus: 'It might not be, it might not be for me; and it will not be, it will not be for me,' would cut off the lower fetters."[32]

<div align="center">

THE ARHAT

</div>

17 "Resolving thus, bhante, that monk would cut off the lower fetters.
But how, bhante, should one see, so that there is the immediate[33] destruction of the influxes?"[34]
18 "Here, bhikshu, the uninstructed worldling trembles at what does not cause trembling [is terrified at what does not terrify].[35]
For, bhikshu, the uninstructed worldling trembles at the thought,
'It might not be, it might not be for me; and it will not be, it will not be for me.'
19 But, bhikshu, the instructed noble disciple does *not* tremble at the thought,
'It might not be, it might not be for me; and it will not be, it will not be for me.' **[58]**

The proliferation of consciousness

20 Consciousness, bhikshu, while standing [while it exists], would stand[36]

stuck to <u>form</u> (taking it as its object),	*rūp'ārammaṇaṁ*
fixed around [supported by] form,	*rūpa,patiṭṭhaṁ*
devoted to delight—	*nand'upasevanaṁ*
would come to growth, increase, abundance.[37]	*vuddhiṁ virūḷhiṁ vepullaṁ āpajjeyya*

---

[32] According to Comy this is attained by seeing the extermination, together with insight. For the four paths together with insight are called "the seeing of extermination of form, etc." (SA 2:275). **Bodhi,** however, interprets this as referring to "the ultimate cessation of the aggregates in nirvana, and thus the realization that such cessation takes place functions as the spur implicit in the meditation formula that inspires the bhikkhu to break the five fetters." (S:B 1063 n77)

[33] "Immediate," *anantarā,* ie in an uninterrupted manner. Also "immediately after." Alt tr: "…so that there follows the immediate destruction of the mental x." Comy explains that there are 2 types of immediacy (*anantara*), proximate and distant. Insight is the proximate immediate cause for the path (because the supramundane path arises when insight peaks), and the distant immediate cause for the fruit (because the fruit directly follows the path) (SA 2:275 f). Here, it refers to "the fruit of arhathood immediately following the path" (*magg'anantaraṁ arahatta,-phalaṁ*) (SA 3:306). Bodhi: "However, as in the commentarial system the fruit inevitably occurs in immediate succession to the path. I think the monk is really asking how to attain arahantship swiftly and directly, without being detained at any lower stage of awakening." (S:B 1075 n131). See **Pārileyya S** (S 22.81.10/3:96), SD 6.1.

[34] "**Mental influxes,**" *āsava.* The term *āsava* (lit "cankers") comes from *ā-savati* "flows towards" (ie either "into" or "out" towards the observer). It has been variously translated as influxes, taints ("deadly taints", RD), corruptions, intoxicants, biases, depravity, misery, evil (influence), or simply left untr. The Abhidhamma lists 4 *āsava*: the influx of (1) sense-desire (*kām'āsava*), (2) (desire for eternal) existence (*bhav'āsava*), (3) wrong views (*diṭṭh'āsava*), (4) ignorance (*avijjâsava*) (D 16.2.4, Pm 1.442, 561, Dhs §§1096-1100, Vbh §937). These 4 are also known as "floods" (*ogha*) and "yokes" (*yoga*). The list of 3 x (omitting the influx of views) [43] is probably older and is found more frequently in the Suttas (D 3:216, 33.1.10(20); M 1:55, 3:41; A 3.59, 67, 6.63). The destruction of these āsavas is equivalent to arhathood. See BDict: āsava.

[35] Comy: The worldling becomes afraid with the arising of weak insight (*dubbala,vipassanā*) because he is unable to overcome self-love, and so becomes afraid, thinking, "Now I will be annihilated and will not exist any more." He sees himself falling down a precipice [**Alagaddûpama S,** M 22.20/1:136,30-137,4 = SD 3.13]. But when strong insight occurs to the instructed noble disciple, he is not afraid but thinks, "It is only formations that arise, only formations that cease." (SA 2:276). For such a case of fearfulness, see eg the youth Yasa's spiritual experience: V 1:15-18 = SD 11.3(7.1-6). "Knowledge of appearance as fearful" (*bhayat'upaṭṭhāna,ñāṇa*) refers to an advanced stage of insight that reveals the fearful nature of formations in the three periods of time: see **Bhāvanā**, SD 25.1.11-(6)(3) (on the 7 purifications) & Vism 21.29-34/645-647. See also S:B 1064 n78 & 1084 n181.

[36] This phrase and the rest: *Rup'upāyaṁ va bhikkhu viññāṇaṁ tiṭṭhamānaṁ tiṭṭheyya rūp'ārammaṇarūpa,patiṭṭh-aṁ nand'upasevanaṁ vuddhiṁ viruḷhiṁ vepullaṁ āpajeyya.*

21 Consciousness, bhikshu, while standing, would stand
      stuck to <u>feeling</u>,
        fixed around feeling,
          devoted to delight—
            it would come to growth, increase, abundance.
22 Consciousness, bhikshu, while standing, would stand
      stuck to <u>perception</u>,
        fixed around perception,
          devoted to delight—
            it would come to growth, increase, abundance.
23 Consciousness, bhikshu, while standing, would stand
      stuck to <u>formations</u>,
        fixed around formations,
          devoted to delight—
            it would come to growth, increase, abundance.

The ending of consciousness

24 Bhikshu, one might say this:
‘Apart from   form,
  apart from   feeling,
    apart from   perception,
      apart from   formations,
        apart from   consciousness,
I will declare the coming and going of consciousness, or its passing away and re-arising [rebirth], or
its growth, increase, abundance’—this is impossible.

25 Bhikshu, if a monk has abandoned lust for	the <u>form</u> element,[38]	
with the abandoning of lust,	the basis is cut off—	
there is no support for consciousness.[39]		
25 Bhikshu, if a monk has abandoned lust for	the <u>feeling</u> element,	
with the abandoning of lust,	the basis is cut off —	
there is no support for consciousness.		
26 Bhikshu, if a monk has abandoned lust for	the <u>perception</u> element,	
with the abandoning of lust,	the basis is cut off—	
there is no support for consciousness.		
27 Bhikshu, if a monk has abandoned lust for	the <u>formation</u> element,	
with the abandoning of lust,	the basis is cut off—	
there is no support for consciousness.		
28 Bhikshu, if a monk has abandoned lust for	the <u>consciousness</u> element,	
with the abandoning of lust,	the basis is cut off—	
there is no support for consciousness.[40]		

Liberation

---

[37] *Rūpûpayaṁ vā bhikkhu viññāṇaṁ tiṭṭhamānaṁ tiṭṭheyya | rūp'ārammaṇaṁ | rūpa,patiṭṭhaṁ | nand'upasevanaṁ vuddhiṁ virūḷhiṁ vepullaṁ āpajjeyya.*

[38] "Element," *dhātu;* here it refers to the sense-objects as the bases for perception.

[39] The whole sentence: *Rūpa,dhātuyā ce bhikkhu bhikkhuno rāgo pahīno hoti rāgassa pahānā vocchijjat'ārammaṇam patiṭṭhitā viññāṇassa na hoti.* The word *vocchijjata* is the passive form of *chindati,* "he cuts of, destroys, remove" (both lit & fig), from √CHID (to cut up).

[40] Here, the first "consciousness" (*viññāṇa*) refers to "cognitive consciousness" (the consciousness arising at the sense-doors), while the second refers to "existential consciousness," ie the rebirth consciousness. In other words, when there is clearly no more attachment to sense-experiences, then rebirth is abandoned. On <u>the 2 kinds of consciousnesses</u>, see *Viññāṇa,* SD 17.8a (6.1).

29 That consciousness that has no support would not increase, would not be formed—
this is liberation.

  Through being freed,   it remains steady.
   Through remaining steady,   it is contented.
    Through contentment,   it is not agitated.
     Through not being agitated,   he personally attains nirvana.

29.2 He understands:

'Destroyed is birth. The holy life has been lived. What needs to be done has been done. There is (for me) no more of arising in any state of being.'

30 Bhikshu, it is for one who knows thus, who sees thus, that there is the immediate destruction of the influxes.''

— evaṁ —

Bibliography

Choong, Mun-keat [Wei-keat]
  2000   *The Fundamental Teachings of Early Buddhism: A comparative study based on the Sūtr-āṅga portion of the Pāli Saṁyutta-Nikāya and the Chinese Saṁyuktāgama.* [Beiträge zur Indologie 32.] Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2000.

060716 090804a 121127 130514 130519 160723